



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



Our Bookstore is OPEN

Over 5000 new & used titles, competitively priced!

Topics: [UFOs](#) - [Paranormal](#) - [Area 51](#) - [Ghosts](#) - [Fortean](#) - [Conspiracy](#) - [History](#) - [Biography](#) - [Psychology](#) - [Religion](#) - [Crime](#) - [Health](#) - [Geography](#) - [Maps](#) - [Science](#) - [Money](#) - [Language](#) - [Recreation](#) - [Technology](#) - [Fiction](#) - [Other](#) - [New](#)

Search... for keyword(s)

in Page Titles

Location: [Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1997](#) -> [Aug](#) -> **Re: Bursting the Balloon**

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Bursting the Balloon

From: **Ted Viens** <drtedv@smart1.net>
Date: Thu, 07 Aug 1997 20:28:32 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 08 Aug 1997 00:54:25 -0400
Subject: Re: Bursting the Balloon

> Date: Thu, 07 Aug 1997 08:29:17 -0500
> To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
> From: joel henry <jhenry@wavefront.com>
> Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: Bursting the Balloon

> >From: DRudiak@aol.com
> >Date: Wed, 6 Aug 1997 16:24:03 -0400 (EDT)
> >To: updates@globalserve.net
> >Subject: Bursting the Balloon -- Pflock again

> -snip-

>>This Klass Klown act seems to be real common among the Roswell
>>debunkers on this group. Brookesmith, Stacey, and Stepkowski
>>also leap immediately to mind. These weak attempts at humor
>>are nothing but side-show diversions from the great
>>intellectual void at the center of their arguments, IMHO.

>>David Rudiak

> This problem is more far reaching than just Roswell. They
> appear to be trying to debunk the whole of ufology and the
> ufologists, witnesses, evidendence to boot. I for one will
> no longer listen to the garbage spewed by these individuals.
> They have PROVEN their incompetence at serious ufological
> investigation, their own attitude problems, and total lack
> of respect for the intelligence of those they are talking
> to and about. Why then are they allowed so much time and
> space to present their views? Is it supposedly fairness that
> lets mindless debunkers have higher status and power than
> those that debate on a reasonable and factual level? There
> is a serious problem here. When Klass pulled his shenanigans
> too many times, he lost credibility and was laughed at and
> seemed to blend into the woodwork for awhile. Now with Pflock,
> Korf, Jeffrey, etc. they can say ANYTHING no matter how pathetic,
> and get more attention and print space than those who have done
> the serious research. Have we stooped to the level of the tabloids
> in pushing controversy first to get people riled up and worry about
> the truth later? They certainly do NOT represent the vast majority
> of ufologists out there and yet are getting more time and space to
> spew their muck. And even in ufological circles like this list!
> It's time to compile their garbage together, cram it in their faces
> publicly and tell them to go to H@ll! Then we can get on with the
> serious research and stop wasting time and space responding to their
> crap. I feel like the debunker slop has gone from knee deep 2 years
> ago to neck deep now. And it doesn't smell any better either.

> Joel Henry

> *****

> Minnesota MUFON Webmaster
> Minnesota MUFON Web Page=
> <http://www.wavefront.com/~jhenry/index.html>

Thank you gentlemen for deepening this conversation. I have been concerned about this problem since joining the UFO Updates list. This is how I see it:

Most people are engaging in a discussion of UFO's. Modestly brief declarative articles are posted of an: I saw this, I read this or I think this nature. Other fair people enter the discussion with some additional personal experiences or thoughts or counterpoints also in modestly brief articles. The conversation may progress through a couple of more generations and by this we learn a little bit more from each other.

But then, (Oh but then,) there appears another peculiar type of contribution to the list. Certain people will submit very lengthy, detailed articles "exposing" a serious flaw in some supportive evidence. Several appearingly well studied individuals will refute the "exposed flaws" in lengthy and I am sure time consuming replies. A new member of the list will probably see this as a healthy and meaningful exchange and a measure of the value of the list.

But then, something strange appears to happen. During the progressing exchange of lengthy and time consuming articles little acknowledgment or movement in the positions of the parties appears to take place, especially on the part of the "exposing" contributor. The articles seem to veer off into personal concerns. The subject fades away.

Ah, but then, something unnerving appears to happen. The person submitting the original "exposed flaw" submits it again essentially unchanged from our first exposure to it. Lengthy articles again generating lengthy replies again consuming much time of the opposing parties.

Let us wonder about what is really going on here. The "exposure" authors never seem to acknowledge the time consuming efforts of the other researchers. The other researchers, apparently always wanting to prevent a misperception from going unanswered, seem suckered into reiterating stale points. This surely must rob them of time they could use digging out new information. Wait, have I stumbled on something here?

Now wait, I do not only imply this is being done by those accused of debunkery. I see this being done also by some supporters of this UFO phenomenon against others. Forgive me Joel, but I see this in the way that some other MUFON members present themselves.

So, how can I make some contribution out of this view of some postings? What if we stopped replying to these rehashed tirades with the prolonged point by point rebuttals? Hold on, I don't really mean allowing articles of questionable truth to go unanswered. Possibly, if the article is a tiring rehash of a worn position, we could reply to it, well snipped, with a remark lamenting the need to repeat the rebuttal of this lame dog and give a pointer in the archives to previous well written replies.

This, of course, is only a suggestion. Knowing that I am already crazy, I will bliss out in the delusion that I could possible contribute to a cleaner more informative environment in this forum.

Thanks... Ted..

Search for other documents to/from: [drtedv](#) | [jhenry](#) | [drudiak](#) | [h](#)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[[This Month's Index](#) | [UFO UpDates Main Index](#) | [MUFON Ontario](#)]

UFO UpDates - Toronto - updates@globalserve.net
Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp - ++ 416-696-0304

A Hand-Operated E-Mail Subscription Service for the Study of UFO Related Phenomena.
To subscribe please send your first and last name to updates@globalserve.net
Message submissions should be sent to the same address.

[[UFO Topics](#) | [People](#) | [Ufomind What's New](#) | [Ufomind Top Level](#)]

To find this message again in the future...
Link it to the appropriate [Ufologist](#) or [UFO Topic](#) page.

Archived as a public service by [Area 51 Research Center](#) which is not responsible for content.
Software by Glenn Campbell. Technical contact: webmaster@ufomind.com

Financial support for this web server is provided by the [Research Center Catalog](#).